REMARKS

I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), asserting anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 5,263,134 to Paal et al. ("Paal"). The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 14, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), asserting anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 5,553,225 to Perry ("Perry"). The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), asserting obviousness based on Paal in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,869 to Moran et al. ("Moran").

II. Summary of this Reply

In this Reply, claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 18, and 21-24 are amended; claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 12 and 13 are cancelled. New claims 25-31 are added; no new matter is added. Support for the new and amended claims can be found, *inter alia,* in the drawings of the originally-filed application.

III. Discussion of Cited Art

U.S. Patent No. 5,263,134 to Paal et al.

Paal discloses a computer program that provides for display of window regions on a display screen. The content and size of one window region (an active window) is controllable in two dimensions using means provided in another window

region (a scroll palette). See Figs. 2 and 4. More specifically, a scroll palette and an active window are provided such that the active window displays to the user a portion of the information available for display, which portion is selected using the scroll palette.

Borders or outlines of viewable areas are displayed within the work areas of the palette. As the view area of the scroll palette is reduced in size, the active window is reduced in an equivalent manner and the view area outline becomes visible as shown in Figs. 5 and 6. Col. 7, lines 41-44.

U.S. Patent No. 5,553,225 to Perry

Perry discloses a method and apparatus for adding a zoom function to scroll bar sliders. Such scroll bars are typically positioned adjacent an image displayed in a window. The sliders of such scroll bars may be directly manipulated to zoom in or zoom out, and to cause corresponding display of an image in an image display window. See Figs 2, 3A, 3B and 5; col. 4, lines 29-50.

IV. Response to 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), asserting anticipation by Paal, and claims 1, 14, 15 and 17, asserting anticipation by Perry. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 13 have been cancelled.

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is proper only if each and every element of

the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14

Amended claim 1 recites displaying an image, and providing a display area of a certain size adjacent the image, via a graphical user interface. Perry neither teaches nor suggests providing a display area adjacent the image for displaying a portion of that image, as recited in the remainder of the claim.

Amended claim 1 further recites displaying a slider that is variable in size according to user input, the slider being displayed superimposed over the image to define a corresponding first portion of the image within a boundary of the slider. When the slider is resized upon a user's manipulation of a mouse, etc., the resized slider is displayed superimposed over the image to define a corresponding resized portion of the image within the slider's boundary. Further, amended claim 1 recites displaying that resized portion of the image in the display area to fill that display area having that same certain size. Accordingly, the selected portions of the image are scaled to fill the display area, which has a fixed size and does not vary directly with any change in size of the slider. In contrast, Paal teaches that the display window (active window) does vary in size according to a resizing of the scroll palette. More specifically, Paal teaches that as the view area of the scroll palette is reduced in size, the active window is reduced in an equivalent manner. See Paal, Figs. 5 and 6; col. 7, lines 41-44.

Further, Perry does not show any slider superimposed over a displayed

image. It is noted that U.S. Patent No. 5,717,869 to Moran et al. ("Moran") discloses an enlarged window for showing a portion of information represented in another window. However, Moran does not disclose that any "slider" is variable in size according to user input, or that any such slider is superimposed over an image such that the corresponding portion of the image is displayed in a separate display area. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14 are requested respectfully.

Additionally, claim 3 recites that the slider may be resized by a click and drag technique, which is neither taught nor suggested by Moran.

Claim 11 further recites displaying a second slider superimposed over the image such that the second slider cooperates with the first slider to define a portion of the image at an intersection of the first and second sliders. In this manner, either the first slider or the second slider may be resized to cause a corresponding change in a selected portion of image. Neither Paal, Perry nor Moran teaches or suggests use of multiple, intersecting, superimposed sliders.

For at least these additional reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3 and 11 are requested respectfully.

Claims 15-17

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to a graphical user interface for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The interface includes an overview display area for displaying an image representing a data file, and a display area for

displaying a portion of that image. The interface further includes a slider superimposed over and translatable over the image. The slider is variable in size according to user input provided by a click and drag technique. Such an interface is neither taught nor suggested by Paal, Perry or Moran.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and are likewise patentable.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 15-17 are requested respectfully.

Claims 18 - 20

Amended independent claim 18 is directed to a method for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The method involves displaying an image via a graphical user interface, and displaying first and second sliders via the interface, each of which is variable in size according to user input, the sliders defining at their intersection a portion of the image. As discussed above with respect to claim 11, neither Paal, Perry nor Moran teach or suggest two intersecting sliders that are superimposed over an image, and that cooperate to define at their intersection a portion of an image that is displayed in a display area. Claim 19 recites that the sliders are variable in size according to user input provided by a click and drag technique.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 18-20 are requested respectfully.

Claims 21-24

Independent claims 21 and 23 are directed to a system and computer program product for displaying a user-selected portion of an image. The system/product displays portions of an image selected by a resizable slider. Regardless of the size of the selected portion, the selected portion is displayed in a display area of a certain size. Accordingly, any resizing of that slider, and corresponding resizing of a selected portion of that image, results in display of the resized portion in a display area that does not change in size. Accordingly, the selected portion is scaled accordingly for display in the display area of a fixed size. This is neither taught nor suggested by Paal, Perry or Moran.

New Claims 25-31

New claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 11, and are therefore likewise patentable for the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 11. Additionally, claim 25 recites that the slider is movable/translatable along a single axis (e.g. a left-right axis). Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and recites that the slider is resizable only along that axis. Accordingly, the slider is constrained from translation or expansion/contraction in other directions, e.g. along an up-down axis.

New claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 15, and contain recitations similar to claims 25 and 26. Claims 29 and 30 are therefore likewise patentable.

New claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 11 and are therefore likewise

patentable for the reasons set forth above for 1 and 11. Additionally, claim 27 recites that the second slider is movable/translatable along only a second axis (e.g., an up-down axis) that is orthogonal to the first axis (e.g., the left-right axis). New claim 28 recites that the second slider is resizable only along the second axis (in the up direction or the down direction). This is neither taught nor suggested by Paal, Perry or Moran.

Claim 31 includes recitations similar to those of claims 26 and 28 and is likewise patentable.

IV. Response to 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), asserting obviousness based on Paal in view of Moran.

A section 103 rejection is proper only if all claim limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Moreover, even if all elements are found in the cited art, there still must be motivation in the cited art to make the proposed combination. MPEP § 2143.01.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over Paal for at least the reasons set forth above. The addition of Moran does not render the claims obvious, since there is nothing in Paal or Moran that suggests or motivates one to make the proposed combination. Without such suggestion/motivation, the rejection is improper.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 14-31 to be patentable and the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 5, 2004

Gregory S. Bernabeo
Registration No. 44,032

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950
Telephone: 215-923-4466
Facsimile: 215-923-2189

M:\GBernabeo\Ibm\P24692.usa\PatentOffice\Final reply12-5-03.doc